

***Final Minutes***  
***Earth Science MPAR WG, Orlando, FL, 1/8/2004***

***March 17, 2004***

*[The minutes reflect comments received from MPAR WG participants during the comment period.]*

Notes from Earth Science WG Kick-Off Meeting – January 8, 2004, Orlando, FL  
MPAR Working Group Break-out Session.

Dr H. K. (Rama) Ramapriyan, NASA, GSFC, Chair.

1.      Introductions

Excluding principals and support staff, 19 attendees could be classified as MPAR WG participants with a good cross section of DAAC, REASON, Federation and SIPS representation.

**Action (Booth):** Produce attendee list.

Completed 1/9/2004

2.      Adopt MPAR WG Charter

Rama read through the draft charter. With some minor editing, the consensus of the WG was that the draft should be adopted. Rama decided to leave the comment period open for 2 weeks – January 22.

**Action (Booth):** Revise current draft with WG edits; distribute to attendee list for comments due January 22. [The comments will be due February 10, 2004 along with comments on these draft minutes.]

**Charter updated and final version placed on MPAR WG web site.**

Revising the Charter – The WG agreed that the Chair/Co-Chair are the stewards of the charter. Any proposed changes to the charter should be sent to the Chairs for consideration. This will be reflected in the revised draft.

3.      Relationship between Federation Metrics group and MPAR WG

The WG noted significant commonality between the two groups and that joint participation in future meetings was important and beneficial to advancing NASA metrics collection and reporting. The Federation stated it would participate in providing metrics to the MPAR WG.

It was noted that the Federation is now focusing on success stories as a means of documenting impact metrics. This is being done largely through their “nugget” anecdotal metrics’ collection. However, the Federation is still collecting “production” metrics.

Since there is no “SEEDS Program Office,” questions were asked about the organization structure that will collect the metrics for aggregation and reporting. It was noted that Kathy Fontaine is responsible for the Earth Science Working Groups’ effort with MPAR WG led by Rama and supported by various contractor staff, as required. There was some discussion about the role of the REASoN Study Managers and the need for clarification.

(Note: Reference to SEEDS Program Office in the draft charter was changed to read ESE (Earth Science Enterprise)).

A question came up about how NASA will use the collected information, and the WG needs to be sensitive to metrics used by OMB for performance measurement. Rama stated that the metrics will not be used for site inter-comparison, and will be aggregated at a fairly high level to show overall data and/or services performance support and success stories for the ESE.

#### 4. Elect Co-Chair

Paul Davis, GLCF Project Manager, University of Maryland, agreed to be the MPAR WG Co-Chair. He was unanimously elected by the attendees. The term will be one year.

#### 5. MPAR Working Group Membership – who else should join?

The WG suggested additional agencies, project, and individuals for membership: Census, Aura Mission, Digital Library, NASA HQ (e.g., Applications Program Manager), NOAA, DAAC User Services, etc. This raised the possibility of inviting both new members into the WG and individuals that could present metrics-related information to the WG, such as NASA Legal and the President’s Management Agenda.

**Action: (All)** Provide Chairs will suggested points-of-contact for possible membership to the WG or for possible invitees to present metrics-related information. This action will be left open and names and contact information will be gathered from members on an on-going basis.

#### 6. Adopt Rules of Operation

The WG reviewed three slides of draft Rules of Operation. There was consensus agreement on the proposed Rules of Operation. The following points were raised by the WG:

- a. The recommendation review process should include other Earth Science WGs.
- b. Kathy noted the importance of the process by stating that approved recommendations will likely show up in future NASA solicitations (CANs, NRAs, etc.)

- c. Depending on the scale and/or scope of a recommendation, the Chairs will determine if the recommendation requires a “shepherd” and the full set of review/justification steps, or if it can simply be adopted by acclamation.
- d. The WG recommended that six start-up subgroups be organized: Research, Applications, Education, Voting, Governance, and Unique Methods of Measuring Metrics (to more accurately reflect progress).
- e. The WG recommended two meetings per year, and the following preferred WG communications: e-mail, telecons, web-site space, groupware, and as needed face-to-face meetings. Consensus was to use e-mail. It was also recommended that the WG meetings be collocated with Federation meetings to facilitate interaction between the two groups.

**Action (Booth):** Per WG comments, revise Rules of Operation and post on MPAR WG web site.

**Revised Rules of Operation included in MPAR WG Introduction to Plenary Session (FINAL) Powerpoint file.**

## 7. Discuss Metric’s Table

The WG discussed an initial baseline set of metrics -- the 10 metrics used by NASA HQ for REASoN contracts. There was considerable discussion about the metrics and their acceptance and definition will be a priority item for the WG. More discussion and agreement is required. Some WG comments are listed below.

- a. The metrics are too DAAC-centric (agreed by all).
- b. Metric definitions are viewed differently and are defined differently based on their discipline source, e.g., science, applications, education, operations. (This led to the WG recommending establishment of 3 subgroups – science, applications, and education -- to consider this uniqueness issue. Also, the connection was made to metrics 8, 9, and 10.)
- c. More human impact and socio-economic metrics need to be defined and implemented. We need to go beyond just collecting “bits and bytes.” (This led to the WG recommending establishment of the Unique Methods of Measuring Metrics Subgroup.)
- d. There are numerous lessons learned in the community on metrics collection; it was recommended that the WG look at EDGRS’ metric definitions.
- e. Metrics validation was raised as an important requirement for any metric collection process.
- f. “Services” need to be included in the metrics list.

**Action (All):** Revise baseline metrics table, staff through WG for comments and recommendations per Rules of Operation.

## 8. Present candidate tools for metrics collection

Two tools were briefed: University of Maryland's Federation Tool, and EDGRS.

9. Discuss tools – get consensus on message to all REASoN PI's

TBD

10. Identify and prioritize work of the group

It was clear that this item was defined by the action items noted above and the FY2004 work plan below. In brief, the work of the group is to define and implement Earth Science Enterprise program metrics and one or more collection tools by June 2004 for initial testing.

11. Discuss FY2004 work plan

Rama discussed the WG's work plan for the remainder of FY2004. There was consensus regarding this plan.

**Note: Work Plan is included in MPAR WG Introduction to Plenary Session Powerpoint (FINAL) file.**

12. Review summary of meeting to present to plenary

The WG completed a fill-in form that was used to expedite the plenary report-out process.

Reference to all documentation mentioned in this report will be made available to the WG members individually for review and comment, or on the Earth Science MPAR WG web site (<http://eos.nasa.gov/seeds> or <http://lennier.gsfc.nasa.gov/seeds/WG/MPAR/index.html> )